



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ET

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,893	06/01/2001	Frederick Douglass	2000-0472	3155

7590 07/25/2006

Samuel H. Dworesky
AT&T CORP.
P.O. Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/872,893		DOUGLIS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou		2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-19 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-19 and 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 21 February 2006 have been received and entered. The applicant has cancelled claims 4, 20 and 33-37. Claims 1-3, 5-19 and 21-32 as amended are pending in the application.
2. The indicated allowability of the limitations of previous claims 4 and 20 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered passages in the reference(s) to Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683. Rejections based on the reference(s) follow.
3. The indicated allowability of claims 9-10 and 25-26 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Martinez et al. U.S. Patent 6,271,846. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 15-19, 21-24, 27 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683.

Referring to claims 1 and 17, Logan et al. teach a computer-implemented method and medium of displaying an anchor (link) on a web page (hypertext display unit recited in column 1, line 61), comprising the steps of displaying a first web page on a display screen, wherein the first web page comprises a first anchor corresponding to a first URL, receiving a user input corresponding to the user selecting the first anchor (user activation of a link) and redisplaying the first web page, wherein content (text, formatting or image formation) associated with the selected anchor is elided (deleted, eliminated) (column 2, lines 21-32 and 42-52), wherein the content comprises the selected anchor (display of user selected displayed anchors can be suppressed, i.e. elided) (column 1, lines 60-67, column 2, lines 47-52, column 5, lines 49-61 and Figure 1).

Referring to claims 2 and 18, Logan et al. teach the content comprising text, as recited in column 2, lines 28-32.

Referring to claims 3 and 19, Logan et al. teach the content comprising a graphic (image formations), as recited in column 2, lines 28-32.

Referring to claims 5 and 21, Logan et al. teach the step of displaying a second web page in the same browser window as the first web page, wherein the second web page corresponds to the selected anchor (browser displays pages corresponding to the user selected link), as recited in column 7, lines 5-17.

Referring to claims 6 and 22, Logan et al. teach the step of displaying a second web page in a browser window other than that in which the first web page is displayed, wherein the second web page corresponds to the selected anchor (displaying a dialog box containing information

related to the link when the user selects it by right clicking on it), as recited in column 14, lines 18-25 and lines 55-59.

Referring to claims 7 and 23, Logan et al. teach receiving an “undo elision” command from the user and redisplaying the first web page, wherein the most recently elided anchor is displayed (the method teaches the ability to “refresh content”, therefore redisplaying the original content of the web page), as recited in column 9, lines 33-35.

Referring to claims 8 and 24, Logan et al. teach receiving an “undo elision” command from the user and redisplaying the first web page, wherein all previously elided anchors are displayed (refreshing the content of the page, displaying all the original content of the web page), as recited in column 9, lines 33-35.

Referring to claims 11 and 27, Logan et al. teach storing information corresponding to the selected first anchor in a data file on a computer system, receiving a new source file corresponding to the first web page (storing information regarding links in a file on the machine and creating a new file containing information regarding the links when selected by the user) and redisplaying the first web page based on the new copy of the source file, wherein the first anchor is elided, as recited in column 2, lines 11-17 and 33-47.

Referring to claims 15 and 31, Logan et al. teach displaying a second web page, wherein in the second web page, second content corresponding to the first selected anchor is elided (a supplemental second page is displayed during the transition between pages where the content associated with the selected link is deleted), as recited in column 2, lines 21-32.

Referring to claims 16 and 32, Logan et al. teach the second web page being displayed in a second window other than the window in which the first web page is displayed (displaying a

Art Unit: 2173

pop-up menu, which corresponds to a user selecting a “white space”, text or image anchor in a different window than the first display), as recited in column 14, lines 18-25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 9-10 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Martinez et al. U.S. Patent 6,271,846.

Referring to claims 9 and 25, Logan et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 17 above. In addition, Logan teaches wherein the first web page further comprises a second anchor corresponding to a second URL (plurality of displayed anchors, i.e. links) (Figure 1), wherein the second anchor is elided (eliding, i.e. suppressing selected anchors) (column 2, lines 47-52). However, Logan fails to explicitly teach wherein the second anchor is displayed in response to user selecting the first anchor. Martinez et al. teach a graphical user interface that displays information such as links similar to that of Logan et al. In addition, Martinez further teaches a second anchor being displayed in response to user selecting the first anchor (information such as links are displayed in a hierarchical tree format, such that selection of a

Art Unit: 2173

first, or parent link expands/displays the corresponding second, or child links) (column 1, lines 22-41 and Figure 5A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Logan and Martinez before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the graphical user interface for selectively displaying and eliding anchors of Logan to include the expandable/collapsible display format of the directory tree taught by Martinez. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to quickly and easily organize information with a common theme or subject matter together, thus saving screen space.

Referring to claims 10 and 26, Logan et al., as modified, teach wherein the first web page comprises at least three anchors (plurality of displayed anchors, i.e. links) (Logan: Figure 1); wherein at least two of the plurality of anchors are elided (the anchors displayed on the page can be elided, or suppressed) (Logan: column 2, lines 47-52), and wherein each of the elided anchors are associated with a priority level (the information displayed in the tree, such as links, are displayed in hierarchical format, thus associated with a priority level, i.e. parent/child priority relationships) (Martinez: column 1, lines 22-41 and Figure 5A); and wherein the selection of the second anchor is based on priority level (children links indented under parent links are selectively displayed, i.e. by expanding and collapsing the display) (Martinez: column 1, lines 22-41, column 3, lines 1-7 and Figure 5A) .

6. Claims 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Cezar et al. U.S. Patent 6,161,127.

Referring to claims 12 and 28, while Logan et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, they fail to teach storing information in a cookie. Cezar et al. teach an Internet advertising display system. This system stores files regarding information to be displayed on a browser similar to that of Logan et al. In addition, Cezar et al. further teach storing information in the browser cookie, as recited in column 1, lines 25-26 and column 5, lines 7-10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Logan et al. and Cezar et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display method and medium taught by Logan et al. to include the use of cookies to store information, as taught by Cezar et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because for example, by storing data on a cookie, the user would not have to re-authenticate the information when he visits the website again.

7. Claims 13-14 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Freishtat et al. U.S. Patent 5,945,989.

Referring to claims 13 and 29, Logan et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. Specifically, they teach eliding web page content, as recited in column 2, lines 21-32 and 42-52. However, Logan et al. fail to teach selectively eliding content based on whether the second web page was successfully displayed. Freishtat et al. teach a method for altering website content similar to that of Logan et al. In addition, Freishtat et al. further teach selectively eliding (updating the content such as adding or deleting information) the content from the web page based on certain conditions (such as commands including personal identification),

Art Unit: 2173

as recited in column 23, lines 55-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Logan et al. and Freishtat et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the content eliding method of Logan et al. to include the selective modification of content based on a certain condition, as taught by Freishtat et al., in order to obtain selective elision of content based on the condition of whether display of the second web page was completed. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination in order to add a layer of security to the updating of website content. By deleting content based on a certain condition, the problem of accidentally deleting important information would be alleviated, since it would be harder to add or delete information because of the added layer of conditions the users have to meet, such as verifying a personal identification.

Referring to claims 14 and 30, Logan et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. Specifically, they teach eliding web page content, as recited in column 2, lines 21-32 and 42-52. However, Logan et al. fail to teach selectively eliding content based on whether the display of the second web page resulted in an error. Freishtat et al. teach a method for altering website content similar to that of Logan et al. In addition, Freishtat et al. further teach selectively eliding (updating the content such as adding or deleting information) the content from the web page based on certain conditions (such as commands including personal identification), as recited in column 23, lines 55-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Logan et al. and Freishtat et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the content eliding method of Logan et al. to include the selective modification of content based on a certain condition, as taught by Freishtat et al., in order to obtain selective elision of content based on the condition of whether display of the second web

Art Unit: 2173

page resulted in an error. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination in order to add a layer of security to the updating of website content. By deleting content based on a certain condition, the problem of accidentally deleting important information would be alleviated, since it would be harder to add or delete information because of the added layer of conditions the users have to meet, such as verifying a personal identification.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



KIEU D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER